
**PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN WASHINGTON
FEASIBILITY STUDY**



Revised January 24, 2008

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chehalis River Basin covers about 2,600 square miles in southwestern Washington. The Chehalis River is about 125 miles long, flowing from the Willapa and Doty Hills northeast and the northwest to Grays Harbor and the Pacific Ocean. The river basin includes portions of Lewis, Thurston, and Grays Harbor Counties, minor amounts of Mason, Jefferson, Pacific, Cowlitz and Wahkiakum Counties, and the cities/towns of Aberdeen, Bucoda, Centralia, Chehalis, Cosmopolis, Elwa, Hoquiam, McCleary, Montesano, Napavine, Oakville, Ocean Shores, Pe Ell, and Westport. Basin uplands include the Willapa and Doty Hills, the western flank of the Cascade Mountains, and the southern Olympic Mountains. Major tributaries include the Newaukum, Skookumchuck, Black, Satsop, Wynoochee, Wishkah, Hoquiam, Humptulips, Johns and Elk Rivers.

The purpose of the General Investigation (GI) feasibility phase of the project development is to investigate and formulate a solution to address water resource needs of the entire Chehalis River Basin. The sponsor's objective is to restore proper natural function to the Chehalis River Basin. The recommended plan identified in the feasibility report must be both technically and economically viable and capable of being implemented to meet project objectives. The feasibility phase includes formulating alternative solutions and assessing impacts to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, evaluating costs and benefits, preparing initial designs, and recommending a plan to initiate solutions to the problem. The project is multipurpose and will investigate Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration in its formulation.

The purpose of the Peer Review Plan (PRP) is to assign the appropriate level and review independence, establish the procedures, and assign responsibilities for conducting the independent technical reviews (ITRs) of all applicable decision documents to ensure the quality and credibility of all decision documents developed during the GI. The PRP is a stand alone document that is part of the greater Project Management Plan (PMP) for the project. This plan is compliant with EC 1105-2-408 *Peer Review of Decision Documents*, 31 May 2005, section 6, parts a. through j. This plan also is compliant with the 20 April 2007 US Army corps of Engineers (USACE) Northwestern Division memorandum *Peer Review Process*. This PRP, Project Management Plan, as well as other project documents are located on the US Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District web page <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/ers/>.

The project delivery team is presented in Table 1. The project manager, Laura Orr, (206) 764 3575 laura.a.orr@usace.army.mil, is the main point of contact at Seattle District for more information about this project and the peer review plan. The National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise phone number is (601) 634 5854 and a Technical Point of Contact is yet to be determined. The National Flood Risk Management Center of Expertise phone number is (415) 503 6590 and a Technical Point of Contact is yet to be determined.

**TABLE 1.
FEASIBILITY PHASE PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM**

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Office/Agency *</u>
Ecosystem Planning of Expertise	(601) 634-5854
Project Manager	CENWS-PM-PL-PF
Program Manager (GI)	CENWS-PM-PL-PF
Program Analyst	CENWS-PM-CP-CM
Plan Formulation	CENWS-PM-PL-PF
Report Formatting/Editing	CENWS-EC-DB-SP
Environmental Coordinator	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Fish & Wildlife	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Cultural Resources	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Historic Properties	CENWS-EC-DB-AS
Environmental Eng/HTRW	CENWS-EC-TB-ET
Biological Analysis	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Civil Design	CENWS-EC-DB-CS
Engineering	CENWS-EC-DB-CS
Survey/ CADD	CENWS-EC-TB-SY
Mapping/GIS	CENWS-IM-PI
Geotechnical	CENWS-EC-DB-CS
Geology	CENWS-EC-TB-GE
Hydraulics & Hydrology	CENWS-EC-TB-HE
Emergency Management	CENWS-OD-EM
Operations	CENWS-OD-TS-NS
Economic Evaluation	CENWS-PM-PL
Cost Engineering	CENWS-EC-CO-C
Real Estate	CENWS-RE-RS
Public Affairs Office	CENWS-PA
Office of Counsel	CENWS-OC
Construction	CENWS-EC-CO
Sponsor PM	Grays Harbor County

*Acronym CENWS refers to Corps Engineers Northwestern Seattle letter following refer to Corps of Engineers office person is located in.

2. PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE

The GI Feasibility Report (FR)/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) not likely to develop or contain influential scientific information and as such is not expected to be an

influential scientific assessment. Therefore, the GI phase documents (i.e. the without project report, the with-plan report, and the Draft EIS/FR) and major engineering products (e.g., sediment management plan) will only be reviewed by an ITR team selected by the Planning Center of Expertise. An external peer review will not be conducted. Model certification is not required at this time on this project. If a model is used on this project, this plan will be revised.

3. REVIEW SCHEDULE

ITRs will be conducted for all major GI phase documents (i.e. without project report, feasibility scoping documents, plan selection report, and Draft EIS/FR) and major engineering and scientific documents products (e.g., cultural resources overview, sediment management plan, and programmatic biological assessment). A review schedule is located in P2, under project number 107834, and will be updated as the study progresses.

PRELIMINARY FEABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE

Description	Scheduled Dates
Execute FCSA	September 30, 2001
Initiate Feasibility Study	October 1, 2001
PMP In-Progress Review	TBD*
Existing W/O Project Conditions Complete	TBD*
Independent Technical Review of W/O Project Conditions	TBD*
Preliminary Screening Complete	TBD*
Plan formulation Complete (Stage I)	TBD*
Plans Selection	TBD*
Independent Technical Review of Plans Selection	TBD*
Feasibility Design Complete	TBD*
Technical Review Complete	TBD*
AFB	TBD*
Public Review Complete (Dft. Feas. Report & Dft. EIS)	TBD*
Feasibility Report With NEPA/SEPA Submitted to NWD	TBD*

* **TBD** – Schedule dates will be determined when project funding is re-initiated through the federal budget.

4. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

An External Peer Review (EPR) will not be conducted as the FR/EIS is not likely to develop or contain influential scientific information and is not expected to be an influential scientific or controversial assessment. In addition one specific requirement of plans to be considered is that they must be non-controversial, environmentally and socially acceptable (able to meet permitting and regulatory requirements). In addition the total project cost is not expected to be in excess of \$50 million dollars which alone would necessitate an EPR, current project estimate is \$25 million.

5. PUBLIC REVIEW OPPORTUNITIES

During the planning process key stakeholders, tribes, agencies, and the general public will have opportunity to comment on the planning process and documents through workshops, public meetings, and other methods outlined in the Communication Plan for the PMP. Additional opportunity will be offered through the NEPA scoping and documentation process. This study is closely coordinated with the Chehalis Watershed Committee, a state-appointed group of stakeholders who oversee basinwide restoration. The project is also aligned with the Grays Harbor Community College. Key public concerns will be provided to technical reviewers for each discipline prior to their review. Documents for review will also be made available on the USACE Seattle District public web page <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/ers/>. A schedule for public review is included in the PMP schedule.

6. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS TO ITR TEAM

Public input from the NEPA workshops and the public scoping meetings will be available to the ITR members to ensure that public comments have been considered in the development of the without project conditions report, the sediment management report, and the draft FR/EIS. However, the draft FR/EIS will be independently reviewed prior to the conclusion of the public comment period, and, therefore, these comments will not be available to the ITR members. In the event that the final FR/EIS is significantly revised from the draft, another ITR will be scheduled and public comment on the draft will be available to the reviewers.

7. ANTICIPATED NUMBER OF REVIEWERS

The current ITR plan is to include at least 11 independent reviewers. This number is based on the disciplines required to develop the feasibility products and the draft and final FR/EIS.

8. PRIMARY DISCIPLINES AND EXPERTISE NEEDED FOR THE ITR

The disciplines and expertise required for the ITR team are presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2.
PROPOSED INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM**

Discipline

Review Team Leader
Plan Formulation
Environmental Coordinator
Flood Risk Management
Coordinator
Hydraulics & Hydrology
Cultural Resources
Civil Design
Geotechnical
Economic Evaluation
Cost Engineering
Real Estate
Sponsor (Grays Harbor County)

This information will be updated as the without project conditions report nears completion.

The Independent Technical Review Team will be selected on the basis of having the proper knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to perform the task and their lack of affiliation with the development of the feasibility report/EIS and associated appendixes. ITR members will be coordinated through the Planning CX (Center of Expertise), and funding their participation may include travel to Seattle District for the review conference. All ITRs will be completed through DRCHECKS (USACE comment review computer program), to the satisfaction of the PCX (Planning Center of Expertise), where comments and comment resolution are captured. In addition a cost review by the Center of Expertise in Walla Walla Washington via the PCX will be conducted.

Technical review will use appropriate analytical methods for each technical area. Technical review will rely on periodic technical review team meetings to discuss critical plan formulation or other project decisions, and on the review of the written feasibility report documentation and files. Independent technical review will ensure that:

- the feasibility report/EIS is consistent with current criteria, procedures and policy
- clearly justified and valid assumptions that are in accordance with established guidance and policy have been utilized, with any deviations clearly identified and properly approved
- concepts, features, analytical methods, analyses, and details are appropriate, fully coordinated, and correct
- problems/issues are properly defined and scoped
- conclusions and recommendations are reasonable and justified.

9. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS

N/A. Please see Section 4.

10. PUBLIC SELECTION OF PEER REVIEWERS

Public recommendation or selection of ITR or other reviewers is not anticipated at this time.